

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

ESTHER MYRTLE SOLOMON, )  
                              )  
Plaintiff,                )  
                              )  
v.                         )              Case No. 4:22-CV-00016 JAR  
                              )  
                              )  
ANN SPALL, et al.,        )  
                              )  
Defendants.                )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This closed civil case is before the Court on Plaintiff's Response and Objection to Memorandum and Order Dated March 15, 2022 and Plaintiff's Response and Objection to Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Dated March 15, 2022 and Plaintiff's Response and Objection to Memorandum and Order Dated March 22, 2022. (Doc. No. 26).

On March 15, 2022, the Court granted Defendants' motions to dismiss, finding Plaintiff failed to state a plausible claim against them and dismissed the case without prejudice. (Doc. Nos. 22, 23). On March 17, 2022, Plaintiff filed a Response and Objection to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Protective Order to Stay Discovery (Doc. No. 24), which the Court construed as a motion for reconsideration of its March 15, 2022 dismissal order and denied. (Doc. No. 25). In her current filing, Plaintiff states she did not receive Defendant Mehalko's motion to dismiss and asks the Court to reconsider its order of dismissal to allow her to respond. She continues to challenge this Court's jurisdiction and argues that the Court failed to consider the facts in support of her claim.

Despite Plaintiff's assertion that she was unaware of Defendant Mehalko's motion, the certificate of service included with the motion attests that on January 10, 2022, the motion "was filed electronically with the Court's CMECF system and served on the parties via the Court's electronic filing system and mailed via US Mail to" Plaintiff at her Colorado address. (See Doc. No. 9 at 2). Further, Plaintiff is repeating arguments previously addressed by this Court and failed to demonstrate any manifest error of law that would cause it to reconsider its previous orders.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Response and Objection to Memorandum and Order Dated March 15, 2022 and Plaintiff's Response and Objection to Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Dated March 15, 2022 and Plaintiff's Response and Objection to Memorandum and Order Dated March 22, 2022 [26], construed as a motion for reconsideration, is **DENIED**.

Dated this 20th day of April, 2022.



\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN A. ROSS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE